THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

-

WRIT PETITION No.21065 of 2005

Between:

Smt. M. Rama Lakshmi W/oM. Polinaidu
R/o Vanjangi Villge and Post Amadalavalasa Mandal,

Srikakulam District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

District Collector, Srikakulam District, Srikakulam

and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

-

WRIT PETITION No. 21065 of 2005

-

ORDER:

The petitioner herein is the authorized dealer of the fair price shop of Vanjangi village, Amadalavalasa Mandal. The authorisation of the petitioner was suspended pending enquiry by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Srikakulam, on an allegation that the petitioner had sold PDS kerosene oil to the persons other than the cardholders and also on the ground of certain other irregularities in distribution of the essential commodities. Questioning the said order, the petitioner filed W.P.No.25253 of 2004 in which an interim order was passed by this Court to continue the petitioner

as dealer. In the meanwhile, the appeal filed by the petitioner before the Joint Collector, Srikakulam, was disposed of by order dated 21.11.2004 directing the Revenue Divisional Officer to complete the enquiry initiated against the petitioner in accordance with law within a period of 15 days. In pursuance of the same, the Revenue Divisional Officer, proceeded with the enquiry and passed an order thereby cancelling the authorisation of the petitioner holding that the allegations made against the petitioner were proved. The appeal preferred was dismissed by the Joint Collector and the revision was also dismissed by the District Collector, Srikakulam, by order dated 28.08.2005. Aggrieved by the said orders, this writ petition is filed. However, strangely, the copies of either the order of the Revenue Divisional Officer or the appellate authority-Joint Collector, have not been placed before this Court. The order of the Revisional authority-District Collector, Srikakulam, dated 28.08.2005, placed before this Court shows that all the three authorities have concurrently held that the allegations made against the petitioner have been established.

In view of the said concurrent findings, I find no justifiable reason to interfere with the impugned order of cancellation.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

_____

(G.ROHINI, J)

2nd January, 2006.

sh